| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|--|
| | 09/941,282 | CHATURVEDI ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Janet L. Andres | 1646 |
| All Participants: | Status of Applicatio | n: |
| (1) <u>Janet L. Andres</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) <u>Michael Badia</u> . | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 15 April 2004 | Time: <u>14:00</u> | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | cant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: 1,2,4 Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENI See Continuation Sheet | ERAL NATURE OF WHAT | WAS DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand | he examiner will provide a record of the substance of | written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview |
| | | |
| //h/// | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicar | nt/Applicant's Representati | ve Signature – if appropriate) |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed that claims 1, 2, and 4 would be amended to more clearly refer to the IMPDH inhibitor VX-148. It was agreed that claims 1 and 2 would be amended to remove language describing optimal compositions because, while it is clear that the composition has been optimized by one set of standards, it is unclear as to what other forms of optimization might be employed to generate and optimal compound..